



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE SIMPLE LOGIC OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

BY W. D. M<sup>o</sup>CRACKAN, OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLICATION  
COMMITTEE.

---

"At that time Jesus answered and said; I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

Matt. xi., 25.

THE writer of an article on Christian Science in the July number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, after describing certain qualifications which he possesses for writing upon the subject, adds the following words:

"If, therefore, I am without some measure of understanding of the personal equation and of the theory and practice of Christian Science, want of opportunity cannot be pleaded in my defense, should injustice be done here in the treatment of the founder and the foundations and what has been built thereon."

Christian Scientists have been accustomed, for several years past, to see the signature of this writer affixed to various articles about Christian Science. They have not attributed the injustice which he has done to the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science and to Christian Science itself, in those articles, to "want of opportunity" on his part; but they have been conscious that he has always approached the subject in a purely critical vein, and that for this reason he has always missed the real significance of Christian Science, and has constantly remained "without some measure of understanding" of his subject. While he has written a great deal *about* Christian Science, he has never been able to write of Christian Science itself.

The door of spiritual understanding will open only to those who knock, and they who are not thirsty cannot drink. If the learned writer sees an "absurd paradox" in Christian Science, it is because he has attempted to understand a spiritual truth through the so-called wisdom of this world. Paul warned the Corinthians against this mistake when he wrote:

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of

God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

But it is not only the manner of the writer's approach which militates against his ability to treat of Christian Science. He has not demonstrated the Science which he attempts to criticise. He has never practised Christian Science. He cannot reform the sinner or heal the sick through Christian Science. From this standpoint, many a Christian Science child, which has learned to use its slight understanding of God, in order to heal its own bruises, or those of its playmates, is better fitted to speak of Christian Science with authority than this learned theologian. At the age of twelve, the young boy Jesus was so far advanced that he astonished the doctors in the temple.

When the writer in the July number has obtained more than a merely theoretical knowledge of Christian Science, so that he can reform the sinner and heal the sick by its methods, then I have no doubt he will be glad to write another article setting forth its marvellous results. These words are not, in any sense, intended to question the sincerity of the writer of the July article. On the contrary, no one could have pursued the subject for years, as he has, without being moved by a distinct purpose. The lack of a proper understanding of the subject is all that is charged against him, due to his purely critical attitude and to his want of practical experience. And because his spirit of sincerity is not questioned, I will take pains, later in this article, to point out in detail wherein the distinguished theologian has done an injustice to his subject, both in his quotations from the Bible and from "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," as well as in the deductions which he has drawn from these quotations.

For the present, I beg to set over against the concept of an "absurd paradox," which he professes to see in Christian Science, the statement that Christian Science is deduced by simple logic from a proper comprehension of the nature of God and man, as revealed in the Scriptures. Step by step the conclusions unravel themselves, inevitably and securely, from established premises. The following is a portion of the excellent definition of Christian Science contained in the Standard Dictionary:

"Christian Science is based on the teachings of Scripture, which it interprets, giving the Christ principle and rule, in Divine metaphysics, which heals the sick and sinner. It explains all cause and effect as mental, and shows the scientific relation of man to God."

All men have deeply implanted in their nature a faith in some first Cause, or some controlling Power. This is what the deist calls God. Now, it has been the misfortune of many orthodox Christian denominations that they have allowed an illogical concept of this God to survive among them. God has been represented as Infinite, Ever-present and Perfect, and yet subject to limitations of outline and form, and in some cases He has even been made capable of anger and hate. In other words, a man-made God has been manufactured to satisfy a limited, human concept. But when all is said and done, what definition of God will alone satisfy the demands of Infinity, Ever-presence and Perfection? Is there any concept except that of Spirit, or Mind, which fulfills these requirements?

Christian Science, then, teaches that God is Spirit, or Mind. But if God is infinite and perfect, He must also be Infinite Good, and this Infinite Good is what we term Love. The idea of a God knowing good and evil, capable of love and hate, rewarding and punishing His children at will, gives place in Christian Science to a new concept. "God is divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love."\*

If God is Spirit, and He made man in His image and likeness, then man must be spiritual, and must reflect God's nature, as the creature reflects the Creator. Everything, therefore, which seems unlike God, or Good, in man must be the result of some false belief, and cannot form a part of the real and indestructible Creation.

The teachings of Christian Science concerning matter and its discordant manifestations in disease are easily distorted by careless critics. Even sincere searchers may misinterpret them unintentionally. Christian Scientists in their attitude towards matter keep abreast of the foremost natural scientists of the day, who have declared that matter can no longer be defined satisfactorily except in terms of mind.

Professor Huxley writes:

"After all, what do we know of this terrible matter except as the name for the unknown hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness."

Grant Allen, the well-known author, in the course of an article on the late Professor Tyndall, thus speaks of matter:

\*"Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," by Mary Baker G. Eddy, page 461.

"The charge of materialism could only be brought against such a man by those abject materialists who have never had a glimpse of the profounder fact, that the universe, as known to us, consists wholly of Mind, and that matter is a doubtful and uncertain inference of the human intelligence."

Professor Wilhelm Müller, the German scientist, said in a recent article:

"The study of chemical combinations led to the establishment of the atomistic theory. The latter is, undoubtedly, ingenious and apparently perfectly logical, but, if we follow it out in its consequences, we soon find ourselves in a dilemma. If the atom is indivisible, it cannot occupy any space, for everything that fills space, no matter how small, can be thought divisible, and must be divisible *ad infinitum*. But, on the other hand, if the atom is really indivisible and does, therefore, occupy no space, it can never be a part, however small, of matter. 0 plus 0 plus 0 plus 0 . . . to infinity would always be equal to 0. The total is equal to the sum of its components. Inasmuch as the total, in this case matter, occupies space, that equality must essentially pertain to every part, however small, of the whole. The logical deduction would be that matter is composed of parts which are not matter, a theory which is obviously unsound."

The view which Christian Scientists take of disease may well be illustrated by the relation which darkness holds to light, or black to the various colors. Darkness is not an entity or a reality, but merely the absence of light; black is not a color, but rather the negation of all color. So disease is viewed in Christian Science as the absence or negation of health, and not as a positive quantity. This is far from calling disease imaginary, for it is just as real as any negation can be. Humanly speaking, disease is distressingly real while it lasts; but when it is entirely gone, destroyed, by whatever means, where is its reality? It might be termed, paradoxically, a temporary reality; but, in point of fact, the real is the eternal and indestructible, and disease certainly does not belong to such a category.

Viewed merely as a therapeutic agent, Christian Science goes one step beyond homeopathy. The latter, in its high potency phase, administers medicine, in which the drug can no longer be detected, even by the subtlest chemical test. As a foremost homeopathic physician once said of such medicines: "There is nothing left but mind."

Now, Christian Science heals by an understanding of Mind—not of the human mind, which modern psychologists have laid bare with such pitiless perseverance—but of the One Mind, or Spirit, which is God. The results are truly marvellous. There

is hardly a known disease which has not yielded to the blessed realization which comes from knowing God, even a little. Herein lies the justification for the title of Christian Science, that it is Christian because it explains the life and works of Christ; and it is scientific, because it produces definite, ascertainable results; and those who attempt to prevent the sick, who cannot find help in any material remedy, from coming to Christian Science are taking a very great responsibility upon themselves.

There is no "absurd paradox" in Christian Science. It starts with Spirit; it holds to Spirit, and ends with Spirit. God and man and the universe are thereby linked together in a logical chain of reasoning. An "absurd paradox," however, does appear in the views concerning God and man and the universe, of which the writer of the July article is a representative. How is it possible to understand logically a God who is Infinite, and yet admits the presence of His opposite, evil? For the term Infinite means All, and there can be nothing more than All. If God is Infinite, and is harmonious, how is it possible to admit the presence of discord, or disease?

The writer of the July article, instead of placing the concept of an "absurd paradox" upon Christian Science, must first explain the "absurd paradox" in his own views. He cannot do this. There is no way out of the dilemma in which he finds himself, except through a realization of the essential unreality of evil and of disease, as taught in Christian Science. Either God knows and permits evil, in which case He cannot be Infinite Good; or He knows no evil, and every concept which falls under that head must be outside of His creation. But God created all things; therefore, if evil exists, God, Infinite Good, must have created it. Is the writer of the July number willing to hold God responsible for all the evil, disease, suffering and crime to which mortals believe themselves to be subject?

Christian Science offers the only logical explanation of the nature of evil which the world has had presented to it since the days of Jesus and his disciples. It uncovers the mystery of evil. Evil is not part of God's Creation. It is illusion and delusion—nothingness—outlawed by common sense. It is a lie, to be branded as such. It is no more real than the horizon line on the sea, which seems to be and is not, and which a traveller might pursue around the earth forever, and never find.

This brief exposition of the logical structure of Christian Science, though inadequate as an explanation of its teachings, will suffice to prepare the reader to see wherein the criticisms of the writer of the July article lack foundation.

Some of the writer's remarks seem to be directed against supposed assertions which are not stated. For instance, it is not clear what authority the writer has for saying that the verse on the fly leaf of "Science and Health" is a "characterization of the Infinite Ego;" no such explanation accompanies the text, but even if this interpretation be correct, he does not tell us what conclusions he draws therefrom.

A quotation from Mrs. Eddy's writings, which he designates as drawn from "elsewhere," is an incorrect rendering from "Miscellaneous Writings," pp. 361-2. Here the word "elucidates" has been changed to "eliminates"—totally changing the sense of Mrs. Eddy's words. Owing to a certain similarity in the appearance of these printed words, and to the fact that they contain the same number of letters, I think this mistake must be ascribed to a typographical error.

The statement that "Mrs. Eddy acts as if she had no peculiar theory of God, man and the universe," is true, in the sense that her theory is as old as Christianity, and her actions are in conformity therewith.

The writer's references to certain souvenir spoons and the supposed "profits" derived from them is on a par with some of the more gossipy insinuations which he has allowed himself to retail in times past. The actual facts concerning these souvenir spoons have been repeatedly stated in the press, and it is to be hoped that the learned divine has now written his last references to them. Upon the request of a citizen of Concord, N. H., and for his benefit solely, Mrs. Eddy gave permission to have her head engraved upon some souvenir spoons. She even recommended her students to buy them, in order to assist the citizen in question, but she herself has never received a cent from the sale of them.

In quoting from page 31 of Mrs. Eddy's work, entitled "No and Yes," the writer of the July article makes an entirely unwarranted insertion of his own into the body of the text, which is calculated to prejudice and deceive the minds of readers. He introduces the name of "Science and Health" after "the Word of

Truth," in such a way as to give the impression that Mrs. Eddy considers these two expressions synonymous. It is evident to any sincere student of Mrs. Eddy's works that she considers the Scriptures to be the Word of Truth, and "Science and Health" merely a "Key to the Scriptures," as its full title indicates.

The critic expresses his inability to understand that matter cannot suffer in and of itself, and yet it is easy to show that all sensation is mental. Surely, no one claims that inorganic matter suffers; then why believe that so-called organic matter does? What is it which distinguishes organic from inorganic matter, except the presence of mind in the first, and its absence in the second? It follows, then, that it is mind, the human, mortal mind, which suffers, and not matter at all; and this mortal mind is not "a species of trick," as the critic implies, but is the same as the carnal mind, spoken of by St. Paul, when he wrote:

"The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

The five physical senses all have a mental origin, according to the testimony of the natural scientists themselves. There is nothing more puzzling to investigators in the whole field of research than the process by which man sees, hears, touches, tastes and smells. The investigator can examine the material mechanisms which seem to perform these functions; he can trace the optic nerves, auditory nerves, olfactory nerves, and the nerves that seem to feel and taste, on their way to the brain; and, just as he thinks he has solved the riddle, he finds himself face to face with an imponderable, immaterial something, which defies his material instruments, something which he calls mind. It baffles his own five physical senses, and yet he knows that it is in control of matter. He locates this mind in the brain. So popular belief places the soul in the organ called the heart; although the Chinese, who wrote treatises on the soul before our ancestors knew how to read and write, place the soul in the liver.

When rightly understood, "Science and Health" agrees with and interprets the Bible, and thus proves to be a veritable "Key to the Scriptures." It has been singularly successful in this task. The heart of the critic would rejoice if he could talk personally with many of the men and women who have become enthusiastic and regular Bible readers through the study of "Science and Health;" they are people who had once searched the Scriptures



in vain for an explanation of the problem of Being, or were indifferent to the Word of God, or even directly hostile to it.

Speaking before the Episcopal Congress in Providence last November, the Rev. E. Winchester Donald, successor to Phillips Brooks as rector of Trinity Church in Boston, said:

"Is Christian Science leading men out of the darkness of unbelief into the light of God? Yes, it is, it is; there can be no doubt about that. You and I know too many Christian Scientists whose lives are blameless, to doubt that."

More recently still, the Rev. Percy S. Grant, rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York, wrote:

"I wish every church member were as spiritually alive, and willing to sacrifice as much for their principles and for their soul development, as are many of the Christian Scientists I know of. It is spiritual life. Every church member ought to practise Christian Science. The more Christian Scientists that I can have in my church, the better I shall like it. When I meet a Christian Scientist, I find a person who is religiously alive and striving after spiritual advancement."

The critic's numerous quotations from the Old Testament, to show that the Hebrews had a system of sanitation and suffered from various diseases, and even his references to medicine, used in a figurative sense, do not carry conviction, for Christian Science is not Judaism, but Christianity. The Master himself never taught sanitation. He healed through Mind, and showed that man was not dependent upon material remedies, and he did this so effectually that he closed the era of fleshly sacrifices for the remission of sins. It was he who said:

"Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on."

Jesus was progressive. He was radical in his teachings. But even taking the events of the Old Testament into consideration, as marking the gradual advance of the Hebrews from materialism to a clearer realization of spirituality, the arguments in favor of healing through Mind instead of matter abound. Many cases of healing without material remedies are recorded from Genesis to Malachi.

Moreover, in place of the writer's enumeration of the mortal, material beliefs of the Hebrews, let me call the attention of the reader to the marvellous prophecy of Isaiah:

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them."

This verse, and the succeeding ones, clearly show that Isaiah

looked for a time when the ferocity of wild beasts and the poison of venomous serpents would be proved unreal.

Surely, the writer of the July article, if he interprets the Scriptures in a mere material sense, would not take upon himself the responsibility of giving the advice which he quotes from Proverbs: "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy heart. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." Many men have followed this advice materially with sad results. But if the word "wine" be used in its spiritual sense of "inspiration," the case is different. Nor can the fact that Jesus uses the words "physician" and "sick" be taken as proving either that he believed in using drugs, or that he acknowledged sickness to be anything more than a false concept of the human mind. He was called the Great Physician, and yet he never used a single drug. On the contrary, his knowledge that sickness was mental is amply proved by his treatment of the man sick of the palsy. He said to him first: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." That was the real healing of the man; then followed the after-effect, the material manifestation of the spiritual regeneration, when Jesus said: "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house."

Paul's prescription to Timothy, of "a little wine for his stomach's sake," seems to have been a concession to material methods, but it was not in conformity with the practice or the advice of Jesus, and here again I question whether the learned divine would repeat the advice. Moreover, what authority has he for affirming that "wherever illness was mentioned by Christ or any of His Apostles, it was spoken of as a reality." Nowhere is this stated explicitly. If illness was a reality then, and is a reality now, and was the work of God, and therefore part of His Creation, what right had Christ or any of His Apostles to destroy it?

When the critic takes exception to the payments made to Christian Scientists for their services, he places himself in a curious position. I have no desire to be in the least personal in refuting his misrepresentations, but the question naturally obtrudes itself as to whether the learned divine would consider it wrong to receive a stipend for his own ministrations? As a matter of fact, both the clergy and the medical profession accept pay-

ment for their services, and rightly, too; then why should not Christian Scientists, who combine in a measure the avocations of both? Jesus and the Apostles did not charge a fee, it is true, for that was not in accordance with the custom of the time and country in which they lived. They accepted hospitality, however; they were provided with board and lodging, and Jesus said expressly that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," and enjoined the Apostles not to carry purse or scrip, implying that they were to live from the grateful gifts of those whom they healed physically and mentally. It is not so long since the country schoolmasters of our pioneer States taught without money payments, but were "kept" by the families of the pupils.

Furthermore, no service can be said to be a strictly complete action until it has produced a corresponding sense of gratitude; and this sense will naturally express itself in material things among men, who are still subject to material beliefs. As a matter of practical experience, giving without receiving tends to pauperize the recipient, as all those who have any experience in charity work have long since discovered. No one, therefore, need cavil at the small remuneration given to Christian Scientists for their work. Patients are often helped who pay nothing at all, or only a mere trifle. But, when all is said and done, no adequate money return can ever be made for the glorious spiritual awakening, and the freedom from fleshly ills, which mark the true healing in Christian Science. Such blessings are beyond price, and this is the tenor of the testimonies of all those who have been thus healed.

So, too, when the critic quotes Jesus' command to the seventy, "Heal the sick," another question arises spontaneously, and that is: Why do not all Christians obey this explicit command of Jesus? Jesus' injunction was for all his followers and for all time. If humble Christians who make no claims to great learning are able to heal the physically sick, what excuse can learned divines have for disobeying the Master's command?

According to my comprehension, when Jesus said to his disciples, "Handle me and see, a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," he was not arguing for the reality of matter, but he was rather rebuking them for their belief in spirits or apparitions.

Far from disparaging "faith," or calling it antagonistic to

"understanding," Mrs. Eddy shows conclusively in her writings the necessity for faith as a stepping stone toward a higher understanding. It is mere blind belief, unsustained by any understanding of the Truth, which Mrs. Eddy declares to be insufficient. Moreover, she deprecates petitioning an All-knowing God for special favors. In Christian Science, prayer rises beyond mere asking, into a realm of realization where God's omnipotence and omnipresence are not questioned. The warning of James must not be disregarded: "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss."

It is perfectly true that Christ never suffered on the cross and never died; but Jesus did. Christian Science makes a vital distinction between the man Jesus and his title of the Christ. Mrs. Eddy writes:

"The word *Christ* is not properly a synonym for Jesus, though it is commonly so used. Jesus was a human name, which belonged to him in common with other Hebrew boys and men—for it is identical with the name of Joshua, the renowned Hebrew leader. On the other hand, Christ is not a name so much as a title, and belongs to our Master exclusively. Christ expresses God's spiritual, eternal idea. The name is synonymous with Messiah, and alludes to the spirituality which was taught, illustrated and demonstrated in the Life whereof Christ Jesus was the embodiment. The proper name of our Master, in the Greek, was Jesus the Christ; but Christ Jesus better signifies the God like."\*

This distinction has helped many a Christian Scientist to understand the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

It is generally conceded that the cures effected by Christian Science are not always instantaneous; and that many of the surgical cases have been turned over to surgeons. But this does not prove that the cures in Christian Science differ in quality from those performed by Jesus and his disciples. Christian Scientists are only beginners in this wonderful work; they have barely entered upon their demonstrations of the healing power of Mind, and they are still learning their A B C at the feet of the Master. They will accomplish better results later on. It may be of interest to recall, in this connection, the fact that even Jesus was not able to do many mighty works in his own country, "because of their unbelief," and that his healing of the blind man of Bethsaida, as related in Mark 8, 22-27, was not instantaneous, but gradual; for, after Jesus had put his hands upon the man for the first time, the latter only saw dimly, and said, "I see men

\*"Science and Health," p. 228.

as trees walking." It was not until Jesus had put his hands again upon his eyes that he "saw every man clearly." Nor is there any Biblical authority for saying, as our critic does, that the disciples "lost no patients," or that "those whom they healed suffered no relapses." There was no record kept of these cases, as far as we know.

Whatever Mrs. Eddy has written concerning the effects of diet and dirt can be readily proved to be correct by actual experience, and the truth of her teachings is being demonstrated daily by hundreds of thousands. It is the beliefs which accompany our eating, drinking and bathing which make these acts beneficial or otherwise to health. Concerning exercise, I find Mrs. Eddy's words wonderfully corroborated in I. Timothy 4, 8, where Paul writes:

"For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

All of these criticisms, on the part of the writer of the July article, result from a grossly materialistic view of Man. If Man is, indeed, a piece of matter-mechanism, then the critic's objections are valid enough, but when Man is understood to be made in the image and likeness of Spirit, and to be a spiritual or mental being, all seeming opposition to Christian Science vanishes in an understanding of its blessed truth.

As for the accuracy of the testimonies offered by those who have been healed by Christian Science, I need only say that these testimonies depend almost invariably upon the reports of physicians. The patients themselves have no professional knowledge of their own diseases. If, therefore, "the number and diversity of diseases from which those whom they heal were suffering" seem great to the critic, he must recognize from this fact how far-reaching the results of Christian Science have really become.

No person of average intelligence any longer denies that cures are performed by Christian Science. In a recent article, T. J. Hudson, the psychologist, gives it as his opinion that Christian Scientists "have healed the sick by hundreds of thousands," and "have poured the balm of religious consolation into many a stricken heart."

Professor G. T. Ladd, of Yale University, testifies to the same fact in another article. He asks himself the question con-

cerning Christian Scientists: "Do they not perform cures? Undoubtedly they do."

The use of the word "incantations" is calculated to deceive. Christian Science treatments are no more incantations than are the prayers of any devout Christian. The critic does not state upon what diseases Christian Scientists show the same inability "to exert the least influence" "which Mormons, anti-medicine faith-healers, spiritualists and occult healers of all kinds encounter." Christian Science has already healed virtually every disease known to the medical profession, but if there are any more to be encountered, I have no doubt that Christian Science will overcome them also.

The failures of Christian Scientists are relatively rare. A very high percentage of cures is effected. While the failures of *materia medica* fill the obituary columns of our newspapers, without attracting any attention, a single failure to apply Christian Science successfully is exploited by sensational methods of all kinds. As a matter of fact, the great majority of failures ascribed to Christian Science in the press have no connection whatever with Christian Science itself. Most of them can be traced to the practices of people who are not Christian Scientists, but who do not employ medical aid for various reasons.

The attitude of Christian Scientists toward the medical profession is one of kindliness and appreciation. The physicians are rapidly growing further away from drugs, and are paying increased attention to mental symptoms. Their self-sacrifice and devotion is gratefully recognized.

Those who carelessly criticise Christian Science would find it hard to account for the fact, that more than a million sensible, sober, and successful men and women, all over the world, hold to it in loving devotion. There are no sermons preached in Christian Science Churches to attract crowds, and nobody is obliged to frequent them. If the denomination is growing with amazing rapidity, it is because it gives those who come to it a wonderful return for their faith.

One of the chief merits of Christian Science is the manner in which it clears away the occultism or mysticism which is commonly supposed to pervade spiritual matters. Christian Scientists are not trifling with contagious diseases, but are law-abiding citizens, and the burden of proof lies with those who

assert the contrary, to show where a single person has been infected by carelessness on the part of Christian Scientists. They are as scrupulous toward other people's beliefs, as they would have others be toward their own faith. Health is a thousand-fold more contagious than disease, and it is hazarding nothing to say that the many groups of Christian Scientists throughout this country and Europe are centres of a new health-giving influence. For all this, the world is indebted to Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, and all fair-minded persons rejoice to hear that her comfortable, though moderate, fortune is but the well-earned wage of a hard-working woman.

The writer of the July article has been pursuing for years a false fabrication of his own making, which he has called Christian Science. And while he has been busy with the false, the real Christian Science has been growing to noble proportions at his side, unperceived. It cannot be fully apprehended by the human, mortal mind. Mortal mind is limited by its very nature. It thinks of man only as a mortal, included between birth and death. It can know nothing of an immortal Being—of Spirit. The life of Jesus is foolishness to mortal mind; it understands neither his conception, nor his healing of sin and sickness, nor his conquest over death, nor his resurrection and ascension. But Christian Science, the Science of Christ, proclaims that sin, sickness and death are not real; that righteousness, health and Eternal Life are real; that the Truth is Good, not evil; that it is Light, not darkness; Principle, not accident; Mind, not matter. Whoever relies exclusively upon what is known as the intellectual faculty, which is only another name for mortal mind, will be disappointed and deceived. Pride of intellect is often a stumbling block. We must become like little children, as single-minded, open-minded, and pure-minded as they, and as trustful of our Heavenly Father as they.

History repeats itself. We read of Jesus that "the common people heard him gladly." To-day the common people, those who are not weighed down with the pride of profession or of place, are once more listening gladly to his Gospel, to Christian Science, which is the Science of his life and teachings.

Jesus said: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

W. D. McCrackan.